REMARKS

Please reconsider the application in view of the following remarks. Applicant thanks the Examiner for carefully considering this application.

Disposition of Claims

Claims 1-3, 22, 24-26, 40, 41, 43, 44, and 57 are pending. Claims 1, 24, and 43 are independent. The remaining claims depend, directly or indirectly, from claims 1, 24, and 43.

Rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-3, 24-26, 40, 43, and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kuwabara (EP 0746119) in view of Broadwin (US Pat. 5,903,816) and further in view of Shoff (US Pat. 6,240,555).

The independent claims, require, in part, (i) the communication centre supplying the Internet response to the transmitting system by sending a data packet, over the PSTN connection, where the data packet contains information to enable the receiver/decoder to extract the Internet response sent over a satellite link; (ii) at the transmitting system, integrating the supplied Internet response into the digital datastream; and (iii) at the receiver/decoder, in the Internet mode, extracting the Internet response from the digital datastream sent over the satellite link and supplying the extracted Internet response to the user.

The Examiner admits on page 6 of the Action that both Kuwabara and Broadwin fail to disclose or render obvious communication of the receiver/decoder and the communication centre via a PSTN, where the internet response is supplied from the communications center to the transmitting system via the PSTN, and at the receiver/decoder, extracting the internet response from the digital datastream in which the internet response is integrated *over a satellite link*.

(Although the Examiner cites Kuwabara on the top of page 4 for this extraction step, but does not cite any portion of Kuwabara that discloses extraction of the Internet response over a satellite link, as required by the claimed invention). Further, Applicants disagree with the Examiner's assertion that the cited portions of Shoff disclose a PSTN (a slow link) that is used to send information to enable a receiver/decoder to extract an internet response sent over a satellite link (a fast link). In fact, Shoff fails to supply that which Kuwabara and Broadwin lack for several reasons.

The Examiner cites col. 5, ll. 61 – col. 8, ll. 3 of Shoff as disclosing the aforementioned limitations required by (i) – (iii) above. However, the Examiner has grossly mischaracterized the teachings of Schoff in equating the cited portion of Shoff with any kind of process that requires two communication links (one slow, one fast) and extraction of an internet response form a digital datastream into which the internet response is integrated by the transmission system. In contrast to the claimed invention, in Shoff, a head end 22 sends a URL to a user device which can be used by that user device to obtain supplemental content from an ISP 80 host 84. This URL is either part of the electronic program guide (EPG) data structure or is provided on separate CDs or other hardware storage devices. *See* Shoff, col. 7, ll. 61-67. Assuming that the URL and/or the supplemental content stored at the location supplied by the URL are equated with the claimed Internet response, when the URL is used to supply the supplemental content, the URL is not provided over a satellite link. Rather, the URL is supplied in the EPG displayed on the user device. Thus, the user's device displaying the EPG does not need a data packet providing information on where to extract the Internet response from, because this information is already in the URL stored in the EPG data structure.

Further, there is no disclosure in Schoff of communication between a communication centre and a transmission system over a PSTN. More specifically, Schoff fails to disclose or render obvious a PSTN that is used to communicate the Internet response to the transmission system, where the transmission system integrates the Internet response within the digital datastream that is sent to the receiver/decoder via a satellite link. In fact, the cited portion of Schoff fails to even mention PSTN or any such communication link. Schoff only discloses the user device (the viewer computing unit 62 displaying the EPG) and the ISP host 80, 84 that stores the supplemental content. Communication between the viewer computing unit 62 and the ISP host in Schoff is performed via a public network 82, which Shoff discloses as the Internet. *See* Schoff, col. 7, ll. 30-31. Clearly, the Internet is not equivalent to a PSTN. The Examiner, in equating the cited portions of Schoff with communication using a PSTN has either mischaracterized the teachings of Schoff, or continues to read claimed limitations overly broad, both of which are wholly improper.

Moreover, in Schoff, there is no extraction performed of the supplemental content provided by the URL. Rather, Schoff discloses that the URL simply causes a response to be transmitted when the URL is itself transmitted by the user device (*see e.g.*, col. 9 line 54 of Shoff). It cannot perform the function of a enabling the user device to extract a response since the response does not exist until after the URL has been transmitted by the user device.

Applicant asserts that Schoff does not at all provide the type of ordered transmission/communication of an Internet response using the structure that is the backbone of the claimed invention. In fact, Schoff does not even have three separate communication paths - one between the receiver/decoder and the communication centre, a second between the communication centre and the transmission system, and a third between the transmission system and the receiver/decoder. Thus, it is not possible for Schoff to disclose or render obvious a PSTN connection between the receiver/decoder and the communication centre and a satellite link over which the Internet response is extracted by the receiver/decoder.

In view of the above, it is clear that Shoff fails to disclose or render obvious the limitations required by (i) – (iii) above, which are admittedly lacking in the teachings of Kuwabara and Broadwin. Thus, the Examiner's assertions cannot support an obviousness rejection of the claims. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 22, 41, and 57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kuwabara, Broadwin, and Shoff, and further in view of Dokic (US Pat. 5,959,659). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As described above, Kuwabara, Broadwin, and Schoff, fail to disclose or render obvious the limitations required by (i)-(iii) above. Further, Dokic fails to supply that which Kuwabara, Broadwin, and Dawson, lack. Specifically, Dokic relates to an MPEG-2 transport stream decoder. Dokic merely discloses sending other data in a private section of an MPEG data stream. However, Dokic is silent with respect to sending an Internet response over a satellite link, and sending information to extract that Internet response over a slower, PSTN link, as required by (i)-(iii) above.

Accordingly, it is clear that Kuwabara, Broadwin, Schoff, and Dokic, whether viewed separately or in combination, fail to disclose or render obvious the limitations recited in the independent claims. Dependent claims 22, 41, and 57 are patentable for at least the same reasons. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

Applicant believes this reply is fully responsive to all outstanding issues and places this application in condition for allowance. If this belief is incorrect, or other issues arise, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned or his associates at the telephone number listed below. Please apply any charges not covered, or any credits, to Deposit Account 50-0591 (Reference Number 11345/11001).

Dated: October 14, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

By Seema Mehta 56,235
for Jonathan P. Osha
Registration No.: 33,986
OSHA · LIANG LLP
909 Fannin Street, Suite 3500
Houston, Texas 77010
(713) 228-8600
(713) 228-8778 (Fax)
Attorney for Applicant